



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/645,613	08/25/2000	Jung Min Song	24286/81551	4585
7590	01/18/2006			EXAMINER KE, PENG
Peter H. Kang SIDLEY AUSTIN BROWN & WOOD LLP Suite 2000 555 California Street San Francisco, CA 94104-1715			ART UNIT 2174	PAPER NUMBER

DATE MAILED: 01/18/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/645,613	SONG ET AL.
	Examiner Peng Ke	Art Unit 2174

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 October 2005.  
 2a) This action is FINAL.                            2b) This action is non-final.  
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 30-49 and 54-57 is/are pending in the application.  
 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.  
 6) Claim(s) 30-49 and 54-57 is/are rejected.  
 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.  
 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  
 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
 a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:  
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_.

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.  
 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)  
 6) Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

## **DETAILED ACTION**

This action is responsive to communications: Amendment, filed on 10/20/05.

Claims 30-49, and 54-57 are pending in this application. Claims 30, 34, 38, 42, and 46 are independent claims. In the Amendment, filed on 4/28/05, claims 30, 34, 38, 42, and 46 were amended and claims 54-57 were added.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 30, 33, 34, 37, 38, 41, 42, 45, 46, 49, 50, and 53 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Foreman et al. US Patent NO. 6,469,711. (Hereafter, it is referred to as Foreman).

As per claim 30, Foreman teaches an apparatus for processing multimedia data, the apparatus comprising:

A memory; and

A processor configured to perform operation comprising:

Generating segment group information defining a segment group that includes a plurality of segment s selected from a multimedia stream, (figure 10, items 192)

wherein said segment group information specifies a group type and a duration for said segment group and wherein the segment group information includes segment order information defining that two or more segments wherein the segment group are unordered; (figure 10, items 192; column 12, lines 26-37) and

Storing the segment group information in the memory. (figure 10, items 192; column 12, lines 26-37; It is inherent that the special effect would be stored in the memory)

As per claim 33, Foreman teaches the apparatus of claim 30, wherein each segment contained in the plurality of segments includes a start time and an end time. (figure 9, item 186)

As per claim 34, Foreman teaches a method for processing multimedia data the method comprising:

generating segment group information; (column 1, lines 65- column 2, lines 50) and transmitting said segment group information to a client, wherein said segment group information (column 1, lines 56-64): defines a segment group that includes a plurality of segment selected from a multimedia stream specifies group type and a duration for said segment and includes segment order information defining that two or more segments with the segment group are unordered. (figure 10, items 192; column 12, lines 26-37

As per claim 37, it is of the same scope as claim 33. Supra.

As per claim 38, it is rejected with the same rationale as claim 30. Supra.

As per claim 41, it is of the same scope as claim 33. Supra.

As per claim 42, it is rejected with the same rationale as claim 34. Supra.

As per claim 45, it is of the same scope as claim 33. Supra.

As per claim 46, it is rejected with the same rationale as claim 30. Supra.

As per claim 49, it is of the same scope as claim 33. Supra.

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 31, 32, 35, 36, 39, 40, 43, 44, 47, and 48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Foreman et al. US Patent NO. 6,469,711 in view of Liou et al. US Patent NO. 6,278,446. (Hereafter, it is referred to as Liou)

As per claim 31, Foreman teaches the apparatus of claim 30. However he fails to teach wherein said segment group information includes a level information.

Liou et al. teaches an apparatus wherein said segment group information includes a level information. (figure 12, items 34, 36, 38, and 40)

It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to include Liou's teaching with apparatus of Foreman to provide user with a tree view of the video hierarchy.

As per claim 32, Foreman and Liou teach the apparatus of claim 31. Liou further teaches wherein said level information can be described by multiple levels.(column 11, lines 63-column 12, lines 10; figure 12, item 40)

As per claims 35 and 36; 39 and 40; 43 and 44; 47 and 48 are of the same scope as claim 31 and 32. Supra.

As per claim 54, Foreman teaches the apparatus of claim 30. However he fails to teach wherein the group type indicates that the segment group related to at least two objects represent in the multimedia stream. (Figure 12, items 36, 40, column 11, lines 60-column 12 ,lines 10; Each root node is an objects in the multimedia stream, therefore the 3<sup>rd</sup> level leafs nodes have at least two root nodes in common)

It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to include Liou's teaching with apparatus of Foreman to provide user with a tree view of the video hierarchy.

As per claim 55, Foreman and Liou teach the apparatus of claim 54, Foreman further teaches the segment group includes segment representing relation changes between the at least two objects, and the segment order information defines that the segments representing relation changes are ordered. (figure 10, items 192; column 12, lines 26-37)

As per claim 56, Foreman and Liou teach the apparatus of claim 55, Foreman further teaches wherein the segment group information indicates that the segment group includes segments that represent highlights from the multimedia stream. (figure 10, items 192; column 12, lines 26-37)

As per claim 57, Foreman and Liou teach the apparatus of claim 54, Foreman further teaches the segment group includes segment representing constant relations between the at least

two objects, and the segment order information defines that segment representing constant relations are unordered. (figure 10, items 192; column 12, lines 26-37)

*Response to Argument*

Applicant's arguments filed on 10/20/05 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant's argued Foreman fails to teach includes segment order information defining that two or more segment<sup>s</sup> within the segment group are unordered. *CK*

Examiner disagrees. During patent examination, the claims are given the broadest reasonable interpretation consistent with the specification. See *In re Morris*, 127 F.3d 1048, 44 USPQ2d 1023 (Fed. Cir. 1997). See MPEP § 2111 - § 2116.01 for case law pertinent to claim analysis. In this case, the attorney suggests that this limitation is consistent with item 602 of figure 6 of Specification. Attorney indicates that since the character relationships listed in item 602 are not ordered by users, therefore the relationships are unordered. Foreman teaches this limitation in a similar fashion. Foreman also displays a list of special effects that are not ordered by users. (figure 10, items 192; column 12, lines 26-37)

*Conclusion*

The following patents are cited to further show the state of the art with respect to interface indicating character relationships:

US Patent 6,492,998, Kim discloses a content-based video story browsing system.

*Contact Information*

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Peng Ke whose telephone number is (571) 272-4062. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Th and Alternate Fridays 8:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kristine L. Kincaid can be reached on (571) 272-4063. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Peng Ke

*Kristine Kincaid*  
KRISTINE KINCAID  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100